

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/699,025	11/03/2003	Stephen Bennett Elliott		2143
7590 01/26/2007 Stephen Bennett Elliott 702 Buffalo Springs Drive Allen, TX 75013		EXAMINER BOCKELMAN, MARK		
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
	•		3766	
SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
3 MONTHS		01/26/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

		· NI			
Office Action Summary  The MAILING DATE of this communication appoint		Application No. Applicant(s)			
		10/699,025	STEPHEN ELLIOT		
		Examiner	Art Unit		
		Mark W. Bockelman	3766		
Period fo	or Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address		
WHIC - Exte after - If NC - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE in me may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. It is period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period we are to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing ed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION  36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim  rill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from  cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).		
Status					
1)🛛	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 Oc	ctober 2006.			
2a)□	This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b)⊠ This action is non-final.				
3)	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is				
	closed in accordance with the practice under E	x parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 45	3 O.G. 213.		
Dispositi	on of Claims				
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□	Claim(s) 1,3,5,7,9,11-15,17-20,22,24 and 26-45 4a) Of the above claim(s) 26-45 is/are withdraw Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) 1,3,5,7,11-15,17-20,22 and 24 is/are r Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	rn from consideration.	<b>1.</b>		
Applicati	on Papers				
10) 🔲	The specification is objected to by the Examiner The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) access Applicant may not request that any objection to the correction of the correct	epted or b) $\square$ objected to by the Edrawing(s) be held in abeyance. See on is required if the drawing(s) is obj	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). ected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).		
Priority u	inder 35 U.S.C. § 119				
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  a) All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No  3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.					
2) Notice 3) Inform	e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) r No(s)/Mail Date 12-01-2005.	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal Pa 6) Other:	te		

## **DETAILED ACTION**

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Carlson USPN 6,301,499. Carlson detects heart rates as well as changes in heart rates which includes changes that occur on a weekly basis. He thus detects transitions from yearly all time minimum and maximum values. The graph in figure 8a provides feedback as to when the yearly maximum and minimum occur as a biofeedback signal. He would also provide feedback through each week before averaging the values though not depicted.

Claims 1,3, 5, 7, 9, 11-15, 17-20, 22, 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Vachillo USPN 5,997,482. Vaschillo provides a feedback monitor that display current heart rates and would thus show graphically all changes in heart rate including maximum heart rates, minimum heart rates and transitions from maximums to minimums and also provides phase angles between breathing rate and heart rate at all such heart rates. The disclosure also suggests that breathing conditioning is used wherein a patient attempts to minimize phase differences between the breathing cycle and the heart rate cycle to match the peaks and troughs and thus the signal is one telling the patient when to inhale and exhale. The peaks on the rate monitor as well as the phase angle are thus considered to be the signal to indicate

Art Unit: 3766

breathing changes. The feedback device also provides a feedback phase difference angle which is considered to be an offset value. All values are capable of being programmable and thus the term "programmable" alone offers no patentable distinction.

## **Double Patenting**

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1,3, 5, 7, 9, 11-15, 17-20, 22, 24 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory double patenting over claims 19-43 of copending Application No. 10/829079. This is a provisional double patenting rejection since the conflicting claims have not yet been patented.

The subject matter claimed in the instant application is fully disclosed in the referenced copending application and would be covered by any patent granted on that

Art Unit: 3766

copending application since the referenced copending application and the instant application are claiming common subject matter, as follows: The claims in this application are merely broader in scope then the '079

Furthermore, there is no apparent reason why applicant would be prevented from presenting claims corresponding to those of the instant application in the other copending application. See *In re Schneller*, 397 F.2d 350, 158 USPQ 210 (CCPA 1968). See also MPEP § 804.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mark W. Bockelman whose telephone number is (571) 272-4941. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 10:00 to 6:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Robert Pezzuto can be reached on (571) 272 -6996. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/699,025

Art Unit: 3766

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through.Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

**MWB** 

January 21, 2007

MARK BOCKELMAN
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Page 5